

## U.S. Warns of Castro Declaration of War on Hemisphere

Following is the text of a *Memorandum* dated on January 30 to James B. Rorke, Jr., Director, *Chairman of the Special Committee for Consideration of Resolutions III and VIII of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs* and *read before the Special Committee on that date*.

JANUARY 30, 1963

No. 52

EXCELLENCY: I refer to note No. 52<sup>2</sup> from the United States Delegation, dated December 14, 1962, transmitting excerpts of speeches by two high Cuban Government officials containing statements openly advocating violence to overthrow established governments in other American Republics. In the same communication it was noted that these statements would be of immediate interest to the governments as a clear indication of the continuing interventions.

<sup>2</sup>For background and texts of resolutions adopted by the Eighth Meeting of Consultation at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on Jan. 31, 1962, see *Bulletin* of Feb. 19, 1962, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup>Not printed here.

FEBRUARY 18, 1963

Aftermath of the Cuban pronouncements of January 30, 1963, and the Cuban Government's continued support for armed insurrection in other countries of the hemisphere.

On January 30, 1963, Prime Minister Fidel Castro in a speech at the closing session of the Congress of Women of the Americas made a major policy statement, further defining the Cuban Government's position of encouragement and support for armed insurrection in other countries of the hemisphere. The statement constitutes a declaration of war against the hemisphere. Given in the context of the present dispute between Moscow and Peking over the strategy and tactics which international communism should follow in its pursuit of world dominion, the statement has added significance since Castro clearly advocates the tactic of violence. There follows the text of the principal sections of what he had to say on this subject:

We must think about how to change that situation [the social and economic conditions in Latin America]. There are persons who are experts on figures, but what is needed are experts on changing the situation, experts on leading peoples on revolutions. That is the art of the revolutionaries, the art that must be learned and developed. How to bring the masses to the struggle?

It is the masses who make history, but for them to make history, the masses must be taken to the battle. That is the duty of leaders and the revolutionary organizations: to make the masses march, to launch the masses into battle. That is what they did in Algeria. And that is what the patriots are doing in South Vietnam. They have sent the masses into battle with correct methods, correct tactics, and they have brought the greatest amount of the masses into the battle.

That is what we did. The four, five, six, or seven of us who one day were separated did not conquer power. It was the movement of the masses that the struggle against the tyranny unleashed which culminated in the victory of the people. . . . These are the historic truths. And we believe that we at least have the right to speak about our historic truths without some long distance theoreticians telling us what happened here without having ever come here. One does not have to whisper about these things, nor must one say them in low tones. They must be said in a loud voice so that they will be heard, really heard.

And let the peoples hear them, because these false interpretations of history tend to create that conformism that all suits imperialism; it tends to create that resignation and reformism and that policy of waiting for the Greek calendar to make revolutions. These false interpretations of history do not conform

and the signature of human, say, of the Latin American countries, where *dependency* conditions are created by imperialists more easily, such that only the most powerful exist—on a few objective and subjective bases. These subjective conditions must be created, and they are created by historic truth, not by fallacies of history.

These subjective conditions are not created by saying that there was a peaceful transition in China, some of the delegates share something about it which is not true. It is not a matter of "we were confused, of mistaken views." We do not deny the possibility of a peaceful transition, but we are still awaiting the first case. But we do not deny it, because we are not pragmatists, and we understand the importance of the first type conditions and the importance of the second type conditions.

We do not deny that we do sometimes things which are useful transitions, and we do protest against all attempts to use the name of the revolution for getting rid of any of other countries where the objective conditions for the revolution exist and where they can do the same thing that we did. It is evident that the imperialists try to prevent revolutions, the imperialists slander the Chinese revolution, they never cease to say the worst horrors, create fear of revolutions among the people. But let me say from a revolutionary position attempts to create conformism or fear of revolutions that is a terrible lie, the imperialists themselves are afraid of conformism, but the revolutionary things are always through periods of violent fear.

This is what we think. That's what we said in the first letter of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in some fragments of which, and from the recent edition, we can see the author of *Historia Ecclesiastica* was all the time writing the last pillar of his system. It would be well to bring up everything we have discussed here. Of course, if we do not want the reader to leave us, we must not let it in print now. But if we tell the reader that the author of *Historia Ecclesiastica* is not the author of *Historia Christianorum*, we have to tell the reader that the author of *Historia Christianorum* is not the author of *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

and the more important, that we are not making an "open season" upon them. I would be the last to insist that each country has its share of callousness, and that it only need not be generalized. But we are not to be blamed for the generalization. We know, however, that there are countries in which these subjects are not only not to be blamed, but they are even in the majority of the English-speaking countries. That is unfortunate. The best solution is, of course, to have the English-speaking countries, and not only the English-speaking countries, of course founded in their constitutions, a right to life.

At the time of the first specimen, the author was at the University of Michigan on January 16, 1930, and

In this opinion of the United States Government the repeated emphasis placed by high officials of the Castro regime on violence to overthrow established governments, coupled with recent outcroppings of sabotage, terrorism and other forms of subversive activity in several American Republics makes it increasingly important that the governments and the appropriate organs of the OAS redouble their vigilance against Castro-communist subversion. Likewise it becomes of major importance that the member governments develop their capacity of countering this threat through individual and cooperative measures.

Because of the importance of the subject matter, I am again asking the Secretary of State to copy of this note to the Chairman of the Committee of the Organization with the request that he make it available to the members of the Committee.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

DELESSERI S. MORRISON

Amitava Mitra

## Representatives of the Family of Sphaeromatidae in the Philippines

## Journal of the Organization of African Studies

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the "right to be forgotten" in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).